GOVERNMENT OF ANDHRA PRADESH
ABSTRACT

PS – PR&RD Department – Irregularities in works executed under Rural & Interior Area Development (RIAD) by PR Engineering Department, in Visakhapatnam District - Disciplinary proceedings initiated and charge framed under Rule 20 of APCS (CC&A) Rules, 1991 against Sri S.V.B. Prasad, the then MEO (AE), PR, Chintapalli, Visakhapatnam and presently A.E, MPP, Paderu – Inquiry conducted – Charge held proved – Imposition of penalty of stoppage one (1) AGI without cumulative effect - Orders – Issued.

PANCHAYAT RAJ AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (VIG-I) DEPARTMENT

G.O.Rt.No.649 Dated:19-10-2023.

Read the following:-

1) Vigilance & Enforcement Department, Vigilance Report 22 (331 /V&E /E2/2010), dt:6.10.2010.
2) G.O.Rt.No.854, PR & RD (Vig-II) Dept., Dated:06.06.2011.
3) From the Engineer-in-Chief, PR, Hyderabad Lr.No.Vig.1/1061/2011, dated18.09.2012 together with WSD of Sri S.V.B. Prasad, MEO, PRI, Chintapalli dt:02.02.2012.
4) Govt.Memo.No.26500/Vig.II/A2/2010-3, Dt:22.03.2012.
5) From Engineer-In-Chief, PR, Vijayawada Lr.No.Vig.I/1061/2011, Dt:15.08.2018.
6) G.O.Rt.No.390, PR&RD(Vig-I)Dept.,Dated:09.07.2020.
7) From Chief Engineer (PR), NABARD and V &QC, Vijayawada (Inquiry Authority) Letter Rc.No.CE (V&QC) / E.Eswara Rao & 4 Others / RIAD/ VSP/2021, dated:27.10.2021.
8) Govt.Memo.No.26500/Vig.I/2010-7, Dt :16.01.2023.
9) Representation from Sri S.V.B. Prasad, AE, MPP, Paderu dt:08.04.2023.

<O>

ORDER:

In the reference 2nd read above, Government have initiated disciplinary proceedings duly framing the following article of charge under Rule-20 of APCS(CC&A)Rules, 1991 against Sri S.V.B. Prasad, the then MEO (AE) PR, Chintapalli, Visakhapatnam District and presently AE, MPP, Paderu, in respect of Irregularities in works executed under Rural & Interior Area Development (RIAD) by PR Engineering Department, Visakhapatnam, with a direction to submit his written statement of defence.

Charge:

"That Sri S.V.B. Prasad, Mandal Engineering Officer (Assistant Engineer), Panchayat Raj, Chintapalli, Visakhapatnam District has misused his official position for his personal gain as he has failed to verify the works position in his jurisdiction as works are already in progress on the execution of works sanctioned under RIAD in Visakhapatnam District contravening the APCS Rules, 1964".

(Contd...P-2)

2. In the reference 3rd read above, the Engineer-in-Chief, Panchayat Raj, AP, Hyderabad among others, has furnished dated acknowledgement copy relating to service of charge on the charged officer. He has further informed that charged officer has submitted his written statement of defence and denied charge.

3. In the reference 4th read above, Government have requested the Engineer-In-Chief, PR to furnish remarks on the written statement of defence of all the charged officers involved in the case.

4. In the reference 5th read above, the Engineer-In-Chief, PR has furnished report duly stating that a detailed enquiry is necessary on the written statements of defence of charge officers involved in the case and requested to appoint Inquiry Officer into the matter.

5. Accordingly, Government have issued orders in the reference 6th read above and appointed the Chief Engineer (NABARD), O/o ENC, PR, A.P.,Vijayawada as Inquiry Authority to inquire into the charges framed against Sri S.V.B. Prasad, the then MEO (AE) PR, Chintapalli, Visakhapatnam District and presently AE, MPP, Paderu, and other four (4) charged officers. The Superintending Engineer, PR, Visakhapatnam District, was appointed as Presenting Officer to present the case on behalf of the Government in support of the article of charge against the said Government Servants before the Inquiry Authority on behalf of the Government under Rule 20(5) (c)of APCS(CC&A)Rules, 1991.

6. In the reference 7th read above, the Chief Engineer (NABARD), O/o ENC, PR, A.P., Vijayawada & Inquiry Officer has submitted Inquiry Report along with his findings. The Inquiry Officer has concluded that the charges framed against Sri S.V.B. Prasad, the then MEO (AE) PR, Chintapalli, Visakhapatnam District and presently AE, MPP, Paderu have been established partially and hence the charges are partially held proved. Government, after examining the said Inquiry Report, have decided to disagree with the findings of Inquiry Officer and accordingly communicated the following disagreement factors along with a copy of Inquiry Report to charged officer, as required under Rule 21(2) of APCS (CC&A) Rules, 1991 and he was directed to submit his representation on the Inquiry Report and the disagreement factors vide reference 8th read above.

"the charged officers given statements that the progress of works have not reached to the stage of recording the measurements as on the date of inspection of V&E Officials. The Inquiry Authority did not consider this aspect and the Inquiry Authority has mentioned that "before execution of the earthwork, the pre-levels are to be recorded and before allowing the Grade-II metal collection, the GSB layer is to be recorded duly verifying necessary quality parameters by the field staff and if the work was allowed to be executed without agreement and measurements are not recorded until the agreement is entered, there is every possibility of difficulty in quantifying the concealed items at later stages". But the Inquiry Authority concluded this as procedural lapse on the part of Charged Officers and held that charges are **partially proved** against the Charged Officers. The findings of Inquiry Authority is not acceptable since charged officer allowed the unauthorized personnel to execute the works in their jurisdiction as on the date of V&E inspection. Hence, Government treated the same as **held proved** against the charged officers".

(Contd.....P-3)

7. In the reference 9th read above, the Charged Officer has submitted his representation on the Inquiry Report and the disagreement factors, stating among other things that, he did not misused official position for his personal gains with relevant document proofs. As per the Inquiry Report charges are not proved against him, hence requested to exonerate him from the charge.

8. Government, after careful examination of the matter, have decided to impose a penalty of stoppage of one (1) annual grade increment without cumulative effect against Sri S.V.B. Prasad, the then MEO (AE) PR, Chintapalli, Visakhapatnam District and presently AE, MPP, Paderu.

9. Accordingly, Government, hereby order to impose a penalty of "stoppage of one (1) annual grade increment without cumulative effect" under Rule-9 (iv) of A.P. Civil Services (CC&A) Rules, 1991 against Sri S.V.B. Prasad, the then MEO (AE) PR, Chintapalli, Visakhapatnam District and presently AE, MPP, Paderu.

10. The Engineer-in-Chief, Panchayat Raj, A.P., Vijayawada, shall take further action in the matter, accordingly.

(BY ORDER AND IN THE NAME OF THE GOVERNOR OF ANDHRA PRADESH)

B RAJSEKHAR
SPECIAL CHIEF SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT

To
Sri S.V.B. Prasad, the then MEO (AE) PR, Chintapalli, Visakhapatnam District and presently AE, MPP, Paderu, (Through ENC, PR, Vijayawada)

The Engineer-in-Chief, Panchayat Raj, A.P., Vijayawada.

Copy to:-
The Secretary to V.C, A.P.V.C,
A.P. Secretariat, Velagapudi.
The General Administration (V&E) Department.
The PR & RD (Estt-I) Department – for information
SF/Sc.

//FORWARDED::BY::ORDER//

SECTIONOFFICER